Interview Summary	10/650,131	MINGISHI ET A	MINGISHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	TISHA D. LEWIS	3681		
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):				
(1) TISHA D. LEWIS.	(3)			
(2) ARLENE P. NEAL.	(4)			
Date of Interview: <u>17 July 2006</u> .				
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☑ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☑ applicant's representative]				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☒ No. If Yes, brief description:				
Claim(s) discussed: 1.				
Identification of prior art discussed: Minigeshi and Fukaya.				
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. g)□ was not reached. h)□ N/A.				
reached, or any other comments: Examiner suggested to applicant's representative (Ms. Neal) that claim 1 should be amended to clarify that the factors "resistance, rigidity and backlash" should present that each or either factor is different between the two planetary gear mechanisms. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.				
			•	
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Exan	niner's signature, if require	ed .	

Application No.

Applicant(s)